UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/529,142 | 01/25/2006 | Peter Von Zimmermann | 07781.0229-00 | 2084 |

60668    7590    03/16/2010
SAP / FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| KANERVO, VIRPI H |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 3691 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 03/16/2010 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| **Office Action Summary** | 10/529,142 | VON ZIMMERMANN ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | VIRPI H. KANERVO | 3691 |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _07 January 2010_.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.  2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-11 and 17-26_ is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-11 and 17-26_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

# DETAILED ACTION

## *Status of the Claims*

1.    Claims 1-11 and 17-26 are presented for examination. Applicant filed an amendment on 08/04/2009 arguing against the grounds of the § 103 rejection of claims 1-11 and 17-26. Examiner has carefully considered Applicant's arguments, but finds them non-persuasive. Therefore, Examiner has maintained the previous grounds of the § 103 rejection of claims 1-11 and 17-26 in the instant Office action. Since Examiner has maintained the previous grounds of § 103 rejection, the rejection of claims 1-11 and 17-26 is a FINAL rejection of the claims.

## *Response to Arguments*

2.    Applicant argues that "Doughty does not disclose or suggest a fist business application and a second business application that can read the output data record by referring to the identification code," that "Doughty does not remedy the deficiencies of Nip and Musmanno," and that "therefore, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and the rejection should be withdrawn." Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The prior art references Nip (2003/0212682 A1), Musmanno (5,940,809), and Doughty (7,363,264 B1), combined discloses all he elements of the instant claims. Nip discloses producing input data and storing output data with an identification code. Nip is modified by Musmanno disclosing transforming input data into an output data that can be configured using one or more business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 27-28; "converting outbound data into desired external formats"), and that the output data record can be read in full or in part by the business application (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-3; "Business Application Processing: These layers perform the actual business functions, such as transferring funds and account maintenance. These layers are also capable of creating standard transactions whenever necessary to complete a transaction") by referring to the identification code (Musmanno: col. 5, lines 42-45: "to alleviate the processing burden, the present system utilizes standard transaction formats in conjunction with a unique identifier (UID) to streamline and simplify all transaction processing"). Nip and Musmanno is then modified by Doughty showing two separate data areas accessed by switching software (Doughty: col. 11, lines 45-67; and col. 12, lines 1-8).

The rationale to support a conclusion that the claim would have been obvious is that (1) all the claimed elements were known in the prior art; (2) one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions; and (3) the combination would have yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention. *See* KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.,

127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007).

Here, (1) Nip discloses all the other elements of the independent claims,

except the input data record having a structure specific to a class of business

transactions and to one or more business applications; transforming, using a

processor, the at least one input data record into an output data record that can

be configured using one or more of the business applications; that the output

data record can be read in full or in part by the business applications by referring

to the identification code; and a first data area and a second data area.

Musmanno discloses the input data record having a structure specific to a class

of business transactions and to one or more business applications; transforming,

using a processor, the at least one input data record into an output data record

that can be configured using one or more of the business applications; and that

the output data record can be read in full or in part by the business applications

by referring to the identification code. Doughty discloses a first data area and a

second data area. Therefore, all the claimed elements were known in the prior

art. (2) Musmanno and Doughty do not change the existing elements in Nip.

Also, the elements in Musmanno and Doughty, which are combined with the

elements of Nip, remain the same after combining the elements of Nip and

Musmanno and Doughty. Therefore, one skilled in the art could have combined

the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective

functions. (3) The results of combination of Nip and Musmanno and Doughty are

predictable because the combination would have yielded nothing more than
predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3.       The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
§ 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a
person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.       Claims 1-11 and 17-26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Nip (2003/0212682 A1) in view of Musmanno (5,940,809), and
further in view of Doughty (7,363,264 B1).

As to claims 1, 11, and 26, Nip shows producing, using a processor, at least one
input data (Nip: page 2, ¶ 22) and storing, in a storage device, the output data
with an identification code (Nip: page 2, ¶ 27).

Nip does not show the input data record having a structure specific to a
class of business transactions and to one or more business applications;
transforming, using a processor, the at least one input data record into an output
data record that can be configured using one or more of the business
applications; and that the output data record can be read in full or in part by the

business applications by referring to the identification code. Musmanno shows the input data record having a structure specific to a class of business transactions (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 11-13) and to one or more business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 25-27); transforming, using a processor, the at least one input data record into an output data record that can be configured using one or more of the business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 27-28); and that the output data record can be read in full or in part by the business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13) by referring to the identification code (Musmanno: col. 5, lines 42-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip by the input data record having a structure specific to a class of business transactions and to one or more business applications; transforming, using a processor, the at least one input data record into an output data record that can be configured using one or more of the business applications; and that the output data record can be read in full or in part by the business applications by referring to the identification code of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

Nip in view of Musmanno does not show a first data area and a second data area, wherein the first data area is configured to be read by a first of the business applications, and the second data area is configured to be read by a

second of the business applications. Doughty shows a first data area and a second data area, wherein the first data area is configured to be read by a first of the business applications, and the second data area is configured to be read by a second of the business applications (Doughty: col. 1, lines 22-63; col. 11, lines 45-67; and col. 12, lines 1-8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Musmanno by a first data area and a second data area, wherein the first data area is configured to be read by a first of the business applications, and the second data area is configured to be read by a second of the business applications of Doughty in order to store, manage and retrieve data for a variety of applications (Doughty: col. 1, lines 33-34).

As to claims 2 and 17, Nip in view of Musmanno, and further in view of Doughty, shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip in view of Doughty does not show that the producing step is performed using a first program module, the transforming step is performed using a second program module, and where the input data record having the specific structure is transferred from the first program module via an interface to the second program module. Musmanno shows that the producing step is performed using a first program module, the transforming step is performed using a second program module, and where the input data record having the specific structure is transferred from the first program module via an interface to the second program module (Musmanno: Fig.

2; col. 3, lines 65-67; and col. 4, lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Doughty by the producing step being performed using a first program module, the transforming step being performed using a second program module, and where the input data record having the specific structure is transferred from the first program module via an interface to the second program module of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 3 and 18, Nip in view of Musmanno, and further in view of Doughty, shows all the elements of to claims 1 and 11. Nip in view of Doughty does not show that the business application is in the form of a third or further program module. Musmanno shows that the business application is in the form of a third or further program module (Musmanno: Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 65-67; and col. 4, lines 1-7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Doughty by the business application being in the form of a third or further program module of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 4 and 19, Nip in view of Musmanno, and further in view of Doughty, shows all the elements of claims 3 and 11. Nip in view of Doughty does not show that the second program module is in a form such that the transformation process in the transforming step can be set by the third program module via an interface. Musmanno shows that the second program module is in a form such that the transformation process in the transforming step can be set by the third program module via an interface (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 16-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Doughty by the second program module being in a form such that the transformation process in the transforming step can be set by the third program module via an interface of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 5 and 20, Nip in view of Musmanno, and further in view of Doughty, shows all the elements of claims 3 and 19. Nip in view of Doughty does not show that the second program module is in a form such that it can read data, which can be selected using the at least two business applications, from the output data record upon a data request from the third program module and can transfer the data to the third program module via an interface for processing or display.

Musmanno shows that the second program module is in a form such that it can read data, which can be selected using the at least two business applications, from the output data record upon a data request from the third program module and can transfer the data to the third program module via an interface for processing or display (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Doughty by the second program module being in a form such that it can read data, which can be selected using the at least two business applications, from the output data record upon a data request from the third program module and can transfer the data to the third program module via an interface for processing or display of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 6 and 21, Nip in view of Musmanno, and further in view of Doughty, shows all the elements of claims 5 and 20. Nip in view of Doughty does not show that the selectable data can be selected by the third program module. Musmanno shows that the selectable data can be selected by the third program module (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Doughty by the selectable

capable of being selected by the third program module of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 7 and 22, Nip in view of Musmanno, and further in view of Doughty, shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip in view of Doughty does not show that the output data record is stored on a transactional basis. Musmanno shows that the output data record is stored on a transactional basis (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Doughty by the output data record being stored on a transactional basis of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 8 and 23, Nip in view of Musmanno, and further in view of Doughty, shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip in view of Doughty does not show that the output data record includes, for a plurality of business applications, a database structure having one or more tables. Musmanno shows that the output data record includes, for a plurality of business applications, a database structure having one or more tables (Musmanno: col. 5, lines 6-8 and 52-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have

modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Doughty by the output data

record including, for a plurality of business applications, a database structure

having one or more tables of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data

processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and

liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 9 and 24, Nip in view of Musmanno, and further in view of Doughty,

shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip in view of Doughty does not show

that the output data record includes, for different journals in accounting, different

data areas. Musmanno shows that the output data record includes, for different

journals in accounting, different data areas (Musmanno: col. 5, lines 56-67; and

col. 6, lines 1-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in

view of Doughty by the output data record including, for different journals in

accounting, different data areas of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced

data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and

liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

As to claims 10 and 25, Nip in view of Musmanno, and further in view of Doughty,

shows all the elements of claims 1 and 11. Nip in view of Doughty does not show

that the output data record is designed for access via at least two business

applications. Musmanno shows that the output data record is designed for

access via at least two business applications (Musmanno: col. 4, lines 65-67; and col. 5, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and the system of Nip in view of Doughty by the output data record being designed for access via at least two business applications of Musmanno in order to provide an enhanced data processor for managing a plurality of accounts directed to select assets and liabilities (Musmanno: col. 2, lines 3-5).

### Conclusion

5.     **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR § 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6.    Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VIRPI H. KANERVO whose telephone number is 571-272-9818. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander G. Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

7.    Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Virpi H. Kanervo

/Alexander Kalinowski/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3691